DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 697 EA 020 438

AUTHOR Street, Sue; Licata, Joseph W.
TITLE Supervisor Expertise, Teacher Autonomy and Environmental Robustness.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Correlation; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Multivariate Analysis; *Organizational Climate; *Professional Autonomy; School Demography; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Environmental Robustness Semantic Differential; Fidelity of Supervision Scale; Sense of Autonomy Scale

ABSTRACT

This study examines the collective perspective that teachers in schools have about the relationship between the supervisory expertise of the principal, teacher work autonomy, and school environmental robustness. Supervisory expertise, and teachers' satisfaction with the supervisory process, is measured with the "Fidelity of Supervision Scale" (FOSS); teachers' sense of work autonomy is measured by the "Sense of Autonomy Scale" (SAS); and environmental robustness is measured by the "Environmental Robustness Semantic Differential" (RSD), which measures the dramatic content of the school environment. The sample for the study consisted of approximately 1,761 teachers in 3 school districts in a southern state. Summary statistics were computed for each of the three variables in the study, including means, standard deviations, and percentage of total possible scores for the scales and subscales. Correlations were computed to provide a statistical basis for testing hypotheses about the relationships between the variables, and also among demographic and theoretical variables. Results showed (1) a positive significant correlation between teacher autonomy and satisfaction with supervisory expertise; (2) no significant correlation between teacher autonomy and environmental robustness; and (3) a significant correlation between teacher satisfaction, teacher perception of supervisory effectiveness, and environmental robustness. References are included. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299697

SUPERVISOR EXPERTISE, TEACHER AUTONOMY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ROBUSTNESS

Sue Street

and

Joseph W. Licata

111 Peabody Hall
College of Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana

April, 1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. W. Licata

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA020138

Supervisor Expertise, Teacher Autonomy and Environmental Robustness

A growing body of literature on effective schools has regularly emphasized that the principal is a key actor associated with school productivity (Block, 1983; Cawelti, 1980; Lipham, 1981; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981; Sweeney, 1982; Clark, 1980; Hallinger, 1981; Purkey & Smith, 1983). The emerging instructional leadership role of the building principal often focuses on the narrower instructional supervision role. In a parallel fashion, increasing numbers of states have initiated educational reform programs and policies aimed at improving teacher quality. These efforts tend to highlight the supervisory role of the principal (Ellett, 1987). Further, in discerning the supervisory work of school principals, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) conceptualize the principal's instructional management role as involving both direct and indirect activities. They identify clinical supervision as the foremost example of direct activity (e.g., working systematically with individual teachers to improve instruction).

Originally, supervision in education emerged as a mechanism of management and control in school organizations. Alphonso, Firth, & Neville (1981) provided a descriptive account of the evaluation of the concept of supervision from earlier emphasis on inspection of teachers to more recent emphasis on the principles of human relationships in the teacher learning process. The modifier "instructional" preceding supervision has become associated with a particular subset of educational supervision described by Sergiovanni

(1982) as "the task of helping teachers, working in classrooms with students, to be more effective."

Inherent in older notions of educational supervision is the idea of controlling subordinates. The dilemma of bureaucratic control versus professional autonomy has consistently been a topic among educational researchers (Lortie, 1973 & 1969; Waller, 1932). The practice of instructional supervision modelled after Cogan and Goldhammer's clinical supervision is based on the helping aspect of supervision and not on controlling teachers.

Good and Brophy (1986) note that advocates of school improvement (of which instructional supervision may be a part) argue for school autonomy because of unique student and teacher populations and community characteristics, histories and resources, but ironically these same advocates are the least interested in teacher autonomy. The relationship between supervision by the principal and teacher's sense of autonomy seems a valid concern.

Improved school climate is a dimension of effective school organization that has been studied in relation to variables such as student achievement (Brookover & Schneider, 1975; Ellett, Payne, Masters and Poole, 1977; Ellett & Walberg, 1979; Anderson, 1982). Licata and Willower (1978) developed a school climate variable, referred to as "environmental robustness," that is understood in terms of the perceived dramatic content of the school structure. Teacher perceptions of environmental robustness are significantly related to positive attitudes about their work environment (Ellett and Licata, 1982) and school level student achievement (Morris, 1986).

This is a study of the teacher group in the school organization. The study examines the collective perspective that teachers in schools have about supervisory expertise of the principal, teacher work autonomy, and school environmental robustness.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Supervisory Expertise

Supervision is recognized in this study as an activity performed by principals which includes systematic assessment of teacher performance, accurate communication of this assessment to the teacher, and assistance and support in improving teacher performance. This description is somewhat synonymous with what is commonly called clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). In this sense supervision is viewed as a technical process to improve instruction, rather than as a managerial function to control subordinates.

The current study is concerned with a principal's expertise as a supervisor of instruction. Expertise as a supervisor of instruction refers to a concrete set of behaviors, skills, and/or knowledge that is demonstrated by a supervisor (principal) to subordinates (teachers). For example, the ability to systematically collect relevant data through frequent classroom observations and make informed assessments of teaching behavior may contribute to the perception of a principal's expertise as an instructional supervisor. The ability to communicate problems and suggest solutions conducive to instructional improvement may also be a skill, that when demonstrated, contributes to the perception of supervisory expertise.

This study examines teachers' collective perspective of the school principal's instructional supervisory expertise. Supervisory expertise is measured with the Fidelity of Supervision Scale (FOSS) (Ellett & Licata, 1985). Teachers are asked to determine whether or not the principal performs certain behaviors during the clinical supervisory process ("yes" or "no" response) and, if yes, also to judge the effectiveness of the performed behaviors. These behaviors are rated "ineffective" (IE) or "highly effective" (HE). For example, a sample item from the FOSS follows:

My principal/assistant principal:

YES/NO	Explained the type of teacher skills/behavior that would be expected of me on the job.	IE	E	HE

A second part of the FOSS (FOSS-E) is a set of ten items designed to measure teacher satisfaction with the supervisory process. Responses to each item are recorded in terms of a four-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Sample items are presented below:

The process of supervision was fair.	SA	A	D	SD
The principal/assistant principal's follow-up on classroom observation was helpful.	SA	A	D	SD

Teacher Autonomy

Teacher autonomy refers tko the independence teachers maintain in exercising discretion within their classrooms to make instructional

decisions. Charters (1974) describes sense of autonomy as a psychological construct representing a teacher's beliefs about his/her freedom from external interference, pressure or control in performing in the work of classroom instruction. Charters (1974) explains that some view public school teaching as providing a high degree of day-to-day autonomy and other sociological observers see teachers as essentially "powerless pawns whose work is closely constrained by bureaucratic rules and guidelines" which they had no voice in establishing.

Charters (1974) conceptualizes both an objective and subjective level of the variable of teacher autonomy. Objectively, autonomy refers to a phenomenological response of the individual to the present situation. A teacher with a high sense of autonomy uses his/her own personal judgement to guide instructional work with students. A low sense of autonomy implies that the teacher feels generally constrained in his/her activities by persons, rules, and regulations, or other conditions and forces outside the immediate instructional setting and outside him or herself. An external constraint on task performance is one which emanates from beyond the immediate instructional setting. Teachers' sense of work autonomy is measured by the Sense of Autonomy Scale (SAS) (Charters, 1974). Teachers rate statements about how they feel about their work using a four-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (SD) to strongly agree (SA). Example items follow:

Curriculum guides exert an uncomfortable influence on what I teach.	SD D A SA

I feel free to try out new teaching ideas with my classes. SD D A SA

Environmental Robustness

Licata and Willower (1978) developed a school climate variable referred to as "environmental robustness" which is conceptualized as the perceived dramatic content of the school structure. Environmental robustness is operationally defined through respondents' perceptions of selected school structures as being relatively interesting, challenging, meaningful, important, powerful, action-packed, unusual, thrilling, active, and fresh.

Environmental Robustness Semantic Differential (RSD) is a measure of the dramatic content of the school environment, based on the notion that social situations can be understood in terms of theatrical analogies which identify actors, plot, setting and audience (Goffman, 1959). Schools and classrooms can be places of high drama and excitement as well as boredom and monotony (Licata and Wildes, 1980). Teachers perceptions of the robustness of: (1) their role as a teacher; (2) their principal; (3) their students; and (4) other teachers were measured using the sample format noted below:

MY ROLE AS A TEACHER IS

BORING ___,___,___,___,___,___,___ INTERESTING

FRESH ___,___,___,___,___,___,___ STALE

MEANINGLESS ___,___,___,___,___,___,___ MEANINGFUL

Statement of the Problem

A principal's supervisory expertise, teachers' sense of work autonomy, and teachers' perceptions of the school's environmental robustness all presumably influence school effectiveness, and are assumed by researchers and school reformers to be interrelated. However, the specific nature of the interrelations among these three work context variables is unclear.

A recent study by Street and Ellett (1987), using individual teacher perceptions as units of analysis, suggests that there are significant positive correlations between: (1) both FOSS scales and the robustness of the teacher and principal roles; and (2) SAS scores and RSD scores for teacher and principal roles. There was no significant relationship reported between SAS and FOSS scales. The study presented in this paper explored these same relationships using the school (teacher mean scores) rather than individual teacher (individual scores) as the units of analysis. The specific problem being investigated in this study is posed in the following question: What are the relationships among a principal's supervisory expertise, teacher work autonomy, and school robustness?

Hypotheses

Viewing the school as a social system, there often is a dynamic tension between role expectations of the institution and need dispositions of the individuals in the school (Getzels and Guba, 1957). In an effort to make things more predictable, schools constantly adapt and adjust to external and internal environments.

One way that teachers adapt is to adopt informal standards that value teacher discretion and autonomy. For example, no two algebra teachers teacher Algebra II in exactly the same way. Each has his/her own individual style which expresses his/her personal needs. Teachers, as a group, have a high tolerance for individualized behavior or autonomy within their classrooms.

In most schools, the teacher works alone within the classroom, relatively hidden from colleagues and superiors, and thus, has opportunity for broad discretion within the boundaries of the classroom (Bidwell, 1965). Given the structural features of schools and the importance teachers place on autonomy, it is not surprising that the type of supervision that teachers value is one that honors discretion or autonomy, as well as role expectations and school goals. The "clinical" supervision model (Goldhammer, 1969), reflected in the FOSS questionnaire is one that probably maintains congruence between teacher autonomy norms and institutional expectations. For example, during the orientation part of the supervisory process, both the teacher and the supervisor interact about the classroom situation, what kinds of teaching skills will be expected, and what the effects of the supervisory process will have on the teacher. This gives credence to teacher style, classroom context and goals and adds to the predictability of the interaction. If this is so, then the following proposition might be advanced:

Proposition One Teachers' perceptions that the supervisory process is supportive of their role expectations and individual needs in classrooms are positively related to their sense of autonomy.

H1: There is a positive correlation between mean FOSS scores for supervisory expertise and mean SAS scores for sense of autonomy.

Positive teacher perceptions of school climate probably occur in contexts that exhibit a supervisory process that encourages both teacher role expectations and needs dispositions and consequently supports teachers' sense of work autonomy. Given these circumstances, teachers are able to adapt and adjust to the demands of their environment and are more likely to view their role, their principal, and their colleagues or their students as "interesting," "challenging," "meaningful," or "powerful." Thus, for such schools, climate perceived by the teacher group would probably be positive. If this is so then the following propositions might be posited:

Proposition Two Teachers' perceptions that their role expectations and discretionary power in classrooms are maintained are positively related to their perceptions of the environmental robustness of key roles in school organization.

H2: There is a positive correlation between mean SAS scores for teacher autonomy and mean RSD scores for selected school roles.

Proposition Three Teacher perceptions that the supervisory process is supportive of their role expectations and discretionary power in classrooms are positively related to their perceptions of the environmental robustness of key roles in the school organization.

H3: There is a positive correlation between mean FOSS scores for supervisory expertise and mean RSD scores for selected school roles.

Methodology

Design

The study was an ex-post-facto design utilized to examine the strength and direction of the correlations between the three variables.

Sample

The sample for the study consisted of approximately 1761 teachers in 62 schools in 3 school districts in a southern state. The schools were predominantly in rural areas, with some located in small cities; none were in metropolitan areas. All teachers in each school district in the 62 schools housing grades k-8 were given a survey packet tko complete. Confidentiality was assured in a letter to each teacher and to the principals. Principals in each school were sent a follow-up letter to encourage them to stress the importance of their teachers completing the survey.

Of the 62 schools sampled, 57 returned 1006 surveys for an overall return rate of 57% using individual teachers. Return rates per school ranged from 20% to 100%, with the majority of the schools returning 50% or more of the surveys. Because the purpose of the study was to examine relationships between instructional supervisory expertise at the school level, teachers' sense of work autonomy and environmental robustness of different aspects of the school, the appropriate unit of statistical analysis was the school mean score.

Instrumentation

A modified version of the Fidelity of Supervision Scale (FOSS) (Ellett & Licata, 1985) was administered to teachers to measure the

principal's expertise as a supervisor of instruction. This scale was selected because it reflected a clinical model of supervision. Clinical supervision is viewed as supervision to improve classroom instruction (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969).

The supervision instrument consists of two sections: a twenty-item scale assessing the supervisory activities/behaviors as practiced by principals and a ten-item attitudinal scale about the supervisory program practiced in the schools. The first section is divided into four parts: Orientation, Observation, Conference, and Follow-up; these parallel dimensions of the clinical supervision process (Goldhammer, 1969). This part of the scale requests two responses: indicate (yes/no) whether the supervisor performed the activity and, if yes, judge the effectiveness (ineffective, effective, or highly effective) of the performance. The second section concerning the attitudes about the supervisory program is scored using a Likert format with four alternatives (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree).

In the present study, the FOSS internal consistency reliability were computed at 0.87 for the FOSS measuring supervisory expertise of the principal. The internal consistency for the FOSS-E measuring teachers' attitudes about the supervisory program in their schools was computed at 0.92.

Teacher work autonomy was measured with the Sense of Autonomy Scale (SAS) developed by Charters and associates (1974). The scale includes both an objective and subjective level of the variable of teacher autonomy. Objectively, autonomy connotes teacher power or

discretion. Subjectively, autonomy refers to a phenomenological response of the individual to the present situation. Internal consistency reliability of the SAS was reported as 0.91 (Charters, 1974). A generalizability coefficient, estimating the separate variance components (persons, items, occasions) yielded a .76 coefficient with the largest contribution of the error term due to the person-by-occasion) components (Charters, 1974). In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for reliability was reported at 0.94.

The Robustness Semantic Differential (RSD) (Licata & Willower, 1978) was administered to teachers to measure environmental robustness. The scale consisted of ten bi-polar adjective pairs to which teachers responded on a seven point scale. In the present study the RSD was applied to four concepts: (1) MY ROLE AS A TEACHER, (2) MY PRINCIPAL, (3) MY STUDENTS ARE, and (4) OTHER TEACHERS ARE.

Concurrent validity of the RSD had been demonstrated for each of the ten pairs of adjectives based on their ability to discriminate significantly between two concepts: dramatic/nondramatic. Test-retest reliability using a four week interval were reported for each pair and the total instruments. For the latter, the Pearson coefficient was .77 and the Spearman coefficient was .78 (Willower & Licata, 1978). Alpha reliability for the RSD scales in the present study ranged from 0.92 to 0.94.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission was obtained from the superintendents in each of three school districts to conduct this study in all schools with grades k-8. Instrument packages were prepared for all teachers in each participating school. Written instructions to each principal accompanied the packets. The school district office was responsible for distributing the packages to the school principals. Principals were asked to distribute the surveys to all teachers in their schools and to request that the teachers return the completed surveys in sealed envelopes to the school secretary within three days. On the third day principals were asked to issue a reminder through the daily bulletin for teachers to turn in surveys if they had not already done so. At the end of one week, principals were instructed to return all completed, sealed teacher packets to the school district office. All surveys were picked up at the school district office within two weeks after delivery.

Data Analyses

Descriptive Statistics

Summary statistics were computed for each of the three variables in this study. Means, standard deviations, and percentage of total possible scores were reported for the scales and subscales using all teachers in the study.

Internal Consistency

Cronbach alpha coefficients were computed to measure the internal consistency reliability of the FOSS, SAS, and RSD. Alpha coefficients

were calculated for the total instrument scores and for each subscale using mean item scores.

Correlation Analyses

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to investigate the research hypotheses. School means were used as the units of statistical analyses. The purpose of this analysis was to provide a statistical basis for testing hypotheses about the relationships between the variables. A two-tailed test at the 0.05 level was set to test the hypotheses. Correlations between the variables and pertinent demographic variables were also computed.

RESULT

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Instruments and Instrument Subscales

Descriptive statistics for the total instrument and instrument scales for the Fidelity of Supervision (FOSS), the Sense of Autonomy Scale (SAS), and the Robustness Semantic Differential (RSD) are presented in Table 1. This table also includes overall sample sizes and mean scores expressed as percentages of the maximum possible score (right-hand column of Table 1). This last index was computed to make the means roughly comparable since the number of items comprising a particular instrument scale and the scoring method used varied from one variable to the next. The legend at the bottom of the table can be used to identify the various variables analyzed.

The results in Table 1 show that, for the most part, teachers as a group were generally positive in their perceptions of the quality

of supervision, degree of work autonomy and robustness of key structures in the school organization. Of the three scales, teachers scored the RSD-T (MY ROLE AS A TEACHER) the highest (74.19% of possible score) and the FOSS the lowest (62.12% of the possible score).

Intercorrelations Between Fidelity of Supervision, Teacher Autonomy, and Environmental Robustness

Table 2 presents a summary of the intercorrelations among the FOSS, SAS, and RSD instrument scales. Of the 21 correlations shown, 11 were statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level and of those, 6 were statistically significant at the $p<.01$ level. Teachers' perceptions of the supervisory expertise (FOSS) of their principals was statistically significant ($p<.01$) in a positive direction to teachers attitudes about the supervision program (FOSS-E) in their schools ($r=.69$). Recall, the FOSS-E variable is a separate variable in the FOSS instrument that evaluates teachers attitudes about the supervisory program in their schools. Supervisory expertise (FOSS) was also positively and significantly ($p<.05$) correlated to teachers perceptions of the robustness of their principals ($r=.28$). Supervisory expertise (FOSS) did not correlate significantly with the other RSD scales or with SAS.

The relationship between teachers attitudes about the supervision program in their schools (FOSS-E) was positively and significantly correlated ($p<.01$) to the robustness of their principals ($r=.47$) and also to the robustness of other teachers ($r=.29$, $p<.05$) and the total for the four robustness scales ($r=.30$, $p<.05$). Teachers attitudes

about the supervisory program in their schools was not significantly correlated to the other RSD scales or to SAS.

Teachers' sense of autonomy did not correlate with any of the scales except positively with FOSS-E, teachers' attitudes about the supervision program ($r=.32$, $p<.05$).

The environmental robustness scales are all positively correlated with one another to indicate association, but not to such an extent that would indicate the same scales. The robustness of the principal had the most significant correlations (correlating to both FOSS and FOSS-E), as noted above. Teachers' perceptions of the role of their students was the only RSD scale not correlated significantly to any of the other variables.

Correlations Among Demographic and Theoretical Variables

Of the relationships among demographic variables and theoretical variables, only average teacher age in schools was significantly related to theoretical variables. It was negatively correlated with all the environmental robustness scales. Age correlated most significantly with teachers perceptions of their principal's robustness ($r=-.41$, $p<.01$) and least significantly with teachers perceptions of their role as a teacher ($r=-.29$, $p<.05$). Teacher age was not significantly correlated to either the FOSS scales or the SAS.

The results noted above present a summary of the major statistical analyses of this study. They will be discussed below in terms of hypothesis testing.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the relationships reflecting the collective perspective that teachers in a school have about principal expertise as an instructional supervisor, teacher work autonomy, and the environmental robustness of different structures in the school. All relationships were hypothesized to be in the positive direction.

The first hypothesis posited a positive correlation between the principal's supervisory expertise and teacher sense of autonomy. Teachers' sense of autonomy was positively and significantly correlated with the FOSS-E variable, concerned with attitudes about the supervisory program. Although teacher autonomy and supervisory expertise of the principal were positively correlated ($r=0.22$), the relationship was not significant ($p>0.05$). This may have been due to a limited variance across schools in the sample on the teacher autonomy (SAS) variable.

The resulting significant, positive correlation ($r=0.32$, $p<0.05$) between the supervisory satisfaction scale (FOSS-E) and the autonomy (SAS) measure in part supports the first hypothesis. Given the nature of the teacher's work environment (i.e., structural looseness, vague and multiple goal structures, no clear-cut work technology), it seems possible that the type of supervision teachers value would be one which positively supports their sense of discretion or autonomy. The supervisory attitude scale (FOSS-E) reflects teachers perceptions of fairness or usefulness of the supervisory program in their schools. It is interesting to note that unlike FOSS, the FOSS-E scale does not necessarily assume that a clinical program of supervision was in

place.

Hypothesis two predicted a positive correlation between teacher sense of autonomy and environmental robustness. Although the correlations between teachers' sense of autonomy (SAS) and the various robustness (RSD) scales resulted in the predicted positive direction, all failed to meet significance levels. Therefore, the second hypothesis was not confirmed by the data analyses.

The limited variance noted on the sense of autonomy (SAS) scores across the schools in the sample may have contributed to the low correlation coefficients. On the other hand, teachers can maintain their autonomy and yet this sense of autonomy may not necessarily be related to the robustness of their role as a teacher or their students. For example, a teacher may choose to routinize class work and have a regimented process for pupil control and still feel a strong sense of autonomy. The same teacher may choose an open classroom environment with plenty of activity and a relatively flexible style of teaching and also feel a strong sense of autonomy. Previous studies (Estep, Willower and Licata, 1980; Licata and Wildes, 1980; Willower, Multauf and Licata, 1979) suggest that the first situation would be perceived as a low robustness situation and the second would be perceived as a high robustness situation. Teachers with these two different styles of teaching might feel quite differently about the robustness of key roles in the school, even if they feel the same concerning teacher autonomy.

At the school level, the above situations are indeed depicted on the scatterplots of the relationship between teacher autonomy and the

various robustness scales. Teacher autonomy scores fall within the limited range of possible autonomy scores and the robustness scores show much wider variation. The scatterplots depict schools with similar autonomy scores and quite different robustness scores.

The third hypothesis predicted a significant positive correlation between teacher perceptions of the effectiveness with which their supervisor implements school supervision and their satisfaction with the process and environmental robustness. This hypothesis was confirmed in art as the relationship between the FOSS and the robustness of the principal (RSD-P) was positive and significant ($r=.28$, $p<.05$). Teachers' attitudes about the supervisory program (FOSS-E) and the robustness of the principal (RSD-P) were positive and significant ($r=.47$, $p<.01$) as were teachers' attitudes about the supervisory process and the robustness of other teachers in their school ($r=.29$). However, teachers' perceptions of the supervisory expertise of their principal or their attitudes about the supervisory program in their schools were not related to either the robustness of their role as a teacher (RSD-T) or the robustness of their students (RSD-S).

It is interesting to note that the significant FOSS relationships were with roles external to the classroom, suggesting that effective clinical supervision results in teacher perceptions that their principal and colleagues are "challenging," "meaningful," "important" parts of every day life in school. Since these roles are external to the classroom and this type of supervision apparently does not usually result in teacher resistance, the robustness perception may reflect

the process's potential tko build cooperative and challenging professional relationships while no threatening internal control of classroom life. Further, when teachers perceive effective supervision from their principal, the tend to be more satisfied with the school program of supervision.

It is also interesting to note that teacher age was inversely correlated to all the robustness scales. It seems that the older the school's faculty, the less robust they perceive their school. It may well be that as one gets older, the newness or novelty of every day life in schools is dulled by one's maturity and seen as less robust. It is relatively easy to picture the uncertainty, excitement and eagerness of beginning teachers and the certainty and poise often displayed by the veteran teachers and its probable association with the robustness perception. The variation in age and robustness may suggest the need for very different supervision strategies for teachers at different stages of their careers. It is important to note that age not teaching experience produced these significant relationships.

REFERENCES

Alphonso, R. J., Firth, G. R., Neville, R. F. (1981). Instructional supervision: A behavior system. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Anderson, R. H. & Snyder, K. J. (1985). The relative adolescence of interventional supervision. Record. (Fall)

Bidwell, C. E. (1965). "The school as a formal organization." In J.G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago, Rand McNally.

Block, A. W. (1983). Effective schools: A summary of the research. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services, Inc.

Brookover, W. B. & Schneider, J. M. (1975). Academic environments and elementary school achievement. Journal of Research and Development in Education. 9(1):82-91.

Cawelti, G. (1980). Effective instructional leadership produces greater learning. Thrust for Educational Leadership. Association for California School Administrators, 9(3):8-9.

Charters, W. W. (1974). Sense of Teacher Work Autonomy: Measurement and Findings. Project MITT/Management Implications of Team Teaching, Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Clark, D. (1980). An analysis of research, development, and evaluation reports on exceptional urban elementary schools. In Phi Delta Kappa (ed.), Why do some urban schools succeed? Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Estep, C. R., Willower, D. J., and Licata, J. W. Teacher pupil control ideology and behavior as predictors of environmental robustness. The High School Journal. 63(4):155-159.

Ellett, C. D., Payne, D. A., Masters, J. A. & Pool, J. E. (1977). The relationship between teacher and student assessments of school environment characteristics and school outcome variables. Paper presented at the 23rd annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Hollywood, Florida.

Ellett, C. D. & Walberg, H. J. (1979). Principals' competency, environment, and outcomes. In H. J. Walberg (ed.), Educational environments and effects. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979.

Ellett, C. D. & Licata, J. W. (1982). Teacher perceptions of organizational roles, robustness and their work environment: a regression analysis. Journal of Educational Administration.

20(1):33-44.

Ellett, C. D. & Licata, J. W. (1985). The fidelity of supervision scale. Department of Administrative and Foundational Services, College of Education, LSU.

Ellett, C. D. (1987). Emerging teacher assessment practices: implications for the instructional role of school principals. In W. Greenfield's (Ed.) Instructional Leadership: Concepts and Controversies. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Getzel, J. W. & Guba, E. G. (1957). Social behavior and administrative process. School Review, 65:423-441.

Goffman, E. (1959). Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York, Doubleday.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. New York, Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. (1968). School Effects in Merlin C. Wittrock's (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. 3rd Edition. New York, MacMillan.

Hallinger, P. (1981). Effective Principal, Effective School. Reston, VA: The National Association of Secondary Principals.

Hallinger, P. (1981). Review of research on school effectiveness. Unpublished report prepared for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1985). "Instructional leadership and school socioeconomic status: A preliminary investigation." Administrator's Notebook, 31(5):1-4.

Licata, J. W. & Willower, D. J. (1978). Toward an operational definition of environmental robustness. Journal of Educational Research, 71(4):218-222.

Licata, J. W. & Wildes, J. R. (1980). Environmental robustness and classroom structure. High School Journal, 63(40):149-154.

Lipham, J. A. (1981). Effective Principal, Effective School. Reston, VA: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1-18.

Lortie, D. C. (1969). The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching in Amital Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. New York, Free Press, Chapter 1.

Lortie, D. C. (1973). "Observations on teaching as work." In R.M.W. Travers (ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago,

Rand McNally and Co., Chapter 15.

Morris, B. (1986). Teacher perceptions of multiple dimensions of the work environment, environmental robustness, and school holding power. Unpublished dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

Purkey, S. & Smith, M. (1983). Effective Schools: A review. Elementary School Journal. 83:427-452.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1982). ed. Supervision of Teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Shoemaker, J. & Fraser, H. W. (1981). What principals can do: Some implications from studies on effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappa, 63(4):263-267.

Street, S. & Ellett, C. D. (1987). Teachers' perceptions of principal expertise as an instructional supervisor, teacher work autonomy, and environmental robustness. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas, Texas.

Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 39(5):346-352.

Waller, W. (1932). Sociology of Teaching. London, Chapman and Hall.

Willower, D. J., Multauf, A. D. & Licata, J. W. (1979). Pupil control ideology and behavior and environmental robustness. Elementary School Journal, 79(1):41-46.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Theoretical Variables

Scale	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean %Max.
FOSS	57	37.27	4.98	62.12
FOSS-E	57	29.65	1.84	74.13
SAS	57	70.46	4.28	73.40
RSD-T	57	51.93	5.34	74.19
RSD-P	57	46.64	7.41	66.63
RSD-S	57	49.33	5.70	70.47
RSD-O	57	45.70	6.07	62.29

FOSS - Fidelity of Supervision Scale
FOSS-E - Attitude About Supervision Program
SAS - Sense of Autonomy Scale
RSD-T - RSD - My Role as a Teacher
RSD-P - RSD - My Principal Is
RSD-S - RSD - My Students Are
RSD-O - RSD - Other Teachers Are

Table 2

Correlations Between Theoretical Variables

n = 57

	FOSS	FOSS-E	SAS	T	P	S	O
FOSS	1.00						
FOSS-E	0.69**	1.00					
SAS	0.22	0.32*	1.00				
RSD-T	0.12	0.09	0.22	1.00			
RSD-P	0.28*	0.47**	0.16	0.51**	1.00		
RSD-S	-0.05	0.13	0.10	0.74**	0.29*	1.00	
RSD-O	0.07	0.29*	0.13	0.66**	0.66**	0.79*	1.00

FOSS - Fidelity of Supervision Scale (effectiveness)
FOSS-E - Attitude About Supervisory Program
SAS - Sense of Autonomy Scale
RSD-T - RSD - My Role As A Teacher
RSD-P - RSD - My Principal Is
RSD-S - RSD - My Students Are
RSD-O - RSD - Other Teachers Are
* p=<.05
** p=<.01